

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Resolution ALJ 176-3102  
Administrative Law Judge Division  
December 5, 2002

**R E S O L U T I O N**

RESOLUTION ALJ 176-3102. Ratification of preliminary determinations of category for proceedings initiated by application. The preliminary determinations are pursuant to Article 2.5, Rules 4, and 6.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. (See also Rule 63.2(c) regarding notice of assignment.)

---

The Commission's rules and procedures which implement the requirements of Senate Bill (SB) 960 (Leonard, ch. 96-0856) are, for the most part, found in Article 2.5 of our Rules of Practice and Procedure. The rules and procedures were adopted by the Commission in D.97-11-021, which describes more fully the background to the development of these rules. Rule 4 describes the formal proceedings to which the SB 960 rules (Article 2.5) apply. Rule 6.1 requires the Commission to preliminarily determine a proceeding's category, whether the proceeding requires a hearing, and designate an Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge. Rule 6.1(a) states that the preliminary determination of category is not appealable but shall be confirmed or changed by Assigned Commissioner's ruling. Unless and until a preliminary determination is changed by such ruling, the preliminary determination of category governs the applicability of the other reforms that SB 960 requires. Rule 63.2 provides for petitioning the Commission to reassign a proceeding to another administrative law judge. Rule 63.2(c) establishes the time for filing such a petition. For purposes of Rule 63.2(c), notice of the assignment is the day the assignments associated with this preliminary categorization document appear in the Daily Calendar following the Commission business meeting.

**The Categories**

SB 960 makes sweeping changes in many aspects of the Commission's practices in an effort to improve the quality and timeliness of Commission decision making. It creates three categories of proceedings: adjudicatory, ratesetting, and quasi-legislative. The

applicability of many of the changes it requires depends upon the category assigned to the proceeding. For example, the ex parte rules which apply differ if the proceeding is categorized as adjudicatory rather than quasi-legislative. The Legislature defined each of these procedural categories in Section 7 of SB 960. Consistent with these definitions, the rules provide that:

“‘Adjudicatory’ proceedings are: (1) enforcement investigations into possible violations of any provision of statutory law or order or rule of the Commission; and (2) complaints against regulated entities, including those complaints that challenge the accuracy of a bill, but excluding those complaints that challenge the reasonableness of rates or charges, past, present, or future.

“‘Ratesetting’ proceedings are proceedings in which the Commission sets or investigates rates for a specifically named utility (or utilities), or establishes a mechanism that in turn sets the rates for a specifically named utility (or utilities). ‘Ratesetting’ proceedings include complaints that challenge the reasonableness of rates or charges, past, present, or future. For purposes of this Article, other proceedings may be categorized as ratesetting as described in Rule 6.1(c).

“‘Quasi-legislative’ proceedings are proceedings that establish policy or rules (including generic ratemaking policy or rules) affecting a class of regulated entities, including those proceedings in which the Commission investigates rates or practices for an entire regulated industry or class of entities within the industry.” (Rules 5(b), 5(c), and 5(d).)

### **Mixed or Unclear Category Proceedings**

For a proceeding that may fall into more than one category, the rules allow parties to recommend that the Commission pick the most suitable category, or to recommend dividing the subject matter of the proceeding into different phases or one or more new proceedings, each with its own category. The rules provide that a proceeding that does not clearly fit into *any* of SB 960’s defined categories will be conducted under the rules applicable to the ratesetting category. As such a proceeding matures, the Commission may determine that the rules applicable to one of the other categories, or some hybrid of those rules, would be better suited to the proceeding.

As stated in D.97-06-071, ratesetting proceedings typically involve a mix of policymaking and factfinding relating to a particular public utility. Because proceedings that do not clearly fall within the adjudicatory or quasi-legislative categories likewise typically involve a mix of policymaking and factfinding, the ratesetting procedures are, in general, preferable for those proceedings.



**Next Steps**

As stated above, this preliminary determination of category is not appealable. Once interested parties have had an opportunity to respond to the initiating party's proposed category, the preliminary determination shall be confirmed or changed by Assigned Commissioner's Ruling pursuant to Rule 6(a)(3). This Assigned Commissioner Ruling may be appealed to the full Commission pursuant to Rule 6.4(a). Parties have 10 days after the ruling is mailed to appeal. Responses to the appeal are allowed under Rule 6.4(b), and must be filed and served not later than 15 days after the ruling is mailed. The full Commission will consider the appeal.

Any party, or person or entity declaring an intention to become a party is entitled to petition for reassignment of the proceeding to another Administrative Law Judge, as described in Rule 63.2. Such a petition must be filed no later than 10 days after notice of the assignment. For purposes of Rule 63.2(c), notice of the assignment is the day the assignments associated with this preliminary categorization document appear in the Daily Calendar following the Commission business meeting.

**Conclusion**

The Commission has reviewed the initial pleading of the utility applicants listed in the attached schedule and has made a preliminary determination of category and need for hearing, consistent with the requirements and definitions of Article 2.5 of its rules.

**IT IS ORDERED** that each proceeding listed in the attached schedule is preliminarily categorized, and the need for a hearing is noted.

I certify that the foregoing resolution was duly introduced, passed, and adopted at a conference of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California held on \_\_\_\_\_, the following Commissioners voting favorably thereon:

---

WESLEY M. FRANKLIN  
Executive Director

## PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION SCHEDULE

Resolution ALJ 176-3102 (12/5/02)

<b>NUMBER TITLE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CATEGORY</b>	<b>PRELIM. CATEGORY</b>	<b>HEARING</b>
<b>A02-11-033</b> CROSSLANDS NETWORK LLC, for registration as an interexchange carrier telephone corporation pursuant to the provisions of Public Utilities Code Section 1013.	NDIEC Registration Application	Ratesetting	NO
<b>A02-11-034</b> LIGHTYEAR COMMUNICATIONS, INC., (U 5359-C), for Authority to discontinue certain Telecommunications Services in the State of California.	Ratesetting	Ratesetting	NO
<b>A02-11-035</b> FROEHLICH CONSTRUCTION CO., INC., PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, for an Order authorizing the sale and conveyance of a certain parcel of land in Kern County pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 851.	Ratesetting	Ratesetting	NO
<b>A02-11-036</b> NATIONAL CONTROL NETWORK INC., for authority to transfer control to Jeff L. Foss.	Ratesetting	Ratesetting	NO
<b>A02-11-037</b> ACC TELECOMMUNICATIONS, LLC, for withdrawal of service in Los Angeles, Orange County and San Diego, California.	Ratesetting	Ratesetting	NO
<b>A02-11-041</b> KOUSO COMMUNICATIONS, LLC, for registration as an interexchange carrier telephone corporation pursuant to the provisions of Public Utilities Code Section 1013.	NDIEC Registration Application	Ratesetting	NO
<b>A02-11-042</b> WORLDTEQ CORPORATION, dba MARYLAND WORLDTEQ CORPORATION, for registration as an interexchange carrier telephone corporation pursuant to the provisions of Public Utilities Code Section 1013.	NDIEC Registration Application	Ratesetting	NO
<b>A02-11-044</b> SAN GABRIEL VALLEY WATER COMPANY, for authority to increase rates charged for water service in its Fontana Water Company Division to increase revenues by \$11,573,200 or 39.1% in 2003, \$3,078,400 or 7.3% in 2004, \$3,078,400 or 6.8% in 2005, and \$3,079,900 or 6.4% in 2006. (N02-10-019.)	Ratesetting	Ratesetting	YES

## PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION SCHEDULE

Resolution ALJ 176-3102 (12/5/02)

<b>NUMBER TITLE</b>	<b>PROPOSED CATEGORY</b>	<b>PRELIM. CATEGORY</b>	<b>HEARING</b>
<b>A02-11-045</b> STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, for authorization to widen in the Median Gap of the Existing South Magunden Overhead, Bridge No.50-0384(P.U.C. No. BQ-317.5-A) over tracks owned by the San Joaquin Valley Railroad, in the County of Kern.	Ratesetting	Ratesetting	NO
<b>A02-11-046</b> PORT OF STOCKTON, to install automatic warning devices at Fyffe Avenue and the intersection of Fyffe Avenue at Hooper Drive with passive signing at Embarcadero Drive and Mc Cloy Avenue, at-grade crossings within the County of San Joaquin.	Ratesetting	Ratesetting	NO
<b>A02-11-047</b> JU-CHENG HO, dba GOOD DAY SHUTTLE, for authority to operate as a Passenger Stage Corporation between various points in Orange County, on the one hand, and the John Wayne Airport, on the other hand.	Ratesetting	Ratesetting	NO
<b>A02-11-048</b> GREAT OAKS WATER COMPANY, for an order authorizing it to increase rates for water service for its total service area by \$2,811,000 or 35.5% in the year 2003; by \$978,000 or 9.0% in the year 2004; and by \$978,000 or 9.0% in the year 2005; and by \$978,000 or 9.0% for the year 2006. (N02-10-018.)	Ratesetting	Ratesetting	YES
<b>A02-11-049</b> CHOCTAW COMMUNICATIONS, INC., dba SMOKE SIGNAL COMMUNICATIONS, for order expanding the scope of its existing certificate to include authority to provide limited facilities-based competitive local exchange throughout the service territories of Pacific Bell Telephone Company and Verizon California, Inc.	Ratesetting	Ratesetting	NO
<b>A02-11-050</b> WEST COAST GAS COMPANY, for approval of post 2002 CARE participation goals, LIEE program proposal and balancing account ratemaking proposal.	Ratesetting	Ratesetting	NO
<b>A02-11-051</b> PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, for a permit to construct the San Mateo-Martin No. 4 60 kV conversion project pursuant to General Order 131-D.	Ratesetting	Ratesetting	YES